

A k -core Decomposition Framework for Graph Clustering

Christos Giatsidis

*LIX, École Polytechnique
Palaiseau, 91120, France*

GIATSIDIS@LIX.POLYTECHNIQUE.FR

Fragkiskos D. Malliaros

*LIX, École Polytechnique
Palaiseau, 91120, France*

FMALLIAROS@LIX.POLYTECHNIQUE.FR

Nikolaos Tziortziotis

*LIX, École Polytechnique
Palaiseau, 91120, France*

NTZIORTZIOTIS@LIX.POLYTECHNIQUE.FR

Charanpal Dhanjal

*TSI, Télécom ParisTech
Paris, 75013, France*

CHARANPAL@GMAIL.COM

Emmanouil Kiagias

*LIX, École Polytechnique
Palaiseau, 91120, France*

E.KIAGIAS@GMAIL.COM

Dimitrios M. Thilikos

*CNRS, LIRMM, University of Athens
Montpellier, 34095, France and
Athens, 15784, Greece*

SEDTILK@THILIKOS.INFO

Michalis Vazirgiannis

*LIX, École Polytechnique
Palaiseau, 91120, France*

MVAZIRG@LIX.POLYTECHNIQUE.FR

Editor: -

Abstract

Graph clustering or community detection constitutes an important task for investigating the internal structure of graphs, with a plethora of applications in several domains. Traditional techniques for graph clustering, such as spectral methods, typically suffer from high time and space complexity. In this article, we present CORECLUSTER, an efficient graph clustering framework based on the concept of graph degeneracy, that can be used along with any known graph clustering algorithm. Our approach capitalizes on processing the graph in an hierarchical manner provided by its core expansion sequence, an ordered partition of the graph into different levels according to the k -core decomposition. Such a partition provides an efficient way to process the graph in an incremental manner that preserves its clustering structure, while making the execution of the chosen clustering algorithm much faster due to the smaller size of the graph's partitions onto which the algorithm operates. An experimental analysis on a multitude of real and synthetic data demonstrates that our approach can be applied to any clustering algorithm accelerating the clustering process, while the quality of the clustering structure is preserved or even improved.

Keywords: Graph clustering, community detection, k -core decomposition, graph degeneracy, graph mining

1. Introduction

Detecting clusters or communities in graphs constitutes a cornerstone problem with many applications in several disciplines. Characteristic application domains include social and information network analysis, biological networks, recommendation systems and image segmentation. Due to its importance and multidisciplinary nature, the problem of graph clustering has received great attention from the research community and numerous algorithms have been proposed (see Fortunato, 2010, for a survey in the area).

Spectral clustering (e.g. Ng et al., 2001; von Luxburg, 2007) is one of the most sophisticated methods for capturing and analyzing the inherent structure of data and can have highly accurate results on different data types such as data points, images, and graphs. Nevertheless, spectral methods impose a high cost of computing resources both in time and space regardless of the data on which it is going to be applied (Fortunato, 2010). Other well-known approaches for community detection are the ones based on modularity optimization (Newman and Girvan, 2004; Clauset et al., 2004), stochastic flow simulation (Satuluri and Parthasarathy, 2009) and local partitioning methods (Fortunato, 2010). In any case, scalability is still a major challenge in the graph clustering task, especially nowadays with the significant increase of the graphs’ size.

Typically, the methodologies for scaling up a graph clustering method can be divided into two main categories: (i) algorithm-oriented and (ii) data-oriented. The former considers the algorithm of interest and appropriately optimizes, whenever is possible, the “parts” of the algorithm responsible for scalability issues. Prominent examples here are the fast modularity optimization method (Clauset et al., 2004) and the scalable flow-based Markov clustering algorithm (Satuluri and Parthasarathy, 2009). The latter constitutes a widely used class of methodologies relied on sampling/sparsification techniques. In this case, the size of the graph onto which the algorithm will operate is reduced, by disregarding nodes/edges. However, possible useful structural information of the graph (i.e., nodes/edges) is ignored in this approach.

In this paper, we propose CORECLUSTER, a graph clustering framework that capitalizes on the notion of graph degeneracy, also known as k -core decomposition (Seidman, 1983). The main idea behind our approach is to combine any known graph clustering algorithm with an *easy-to-compute, clustering-preserving* hierarchical representation of the graph – as produced by the k -core decomposition – towards a scalable graph clustering tool. The k -core of a graph is a maximal size subgraph where each node has at least k neighbors in the subgraph (we say that k is the *rank* of such a core). The maximum k for which a graph contains a k -core is known as its *degeneracy*. We refer to this core as “the densest core”. Intuitively, the k -core of such a graph is located in its “densest territories”. Based on this idea, we show that the densest cores of a graph are roughly maintaining its clustering structure and thus constitute *good starting points* (seed subgraphs) for computing it. Given the fact that the size of the densest core of a graph is orders of magnitude smaller than that of the original graph, we apply a clustering algorithm starting from its densest core and then, on the resulting structure, we incrementally cluster the rest of the nodes in the lower rank cores in decreasing order, following the hierarchy produced by the k -core decomposition.

At a high level, the main contributions of this paper are three-fold:

- *Clustering Framework:* We introduce CORECLUSTER, a scalable degeneracy-based graph clustering framework, that can be used along with any known graph clustering algorithm. We show how CORECLUSTER utilizes the k -core decomposition of a graph in order to (i) select seed subgraphs for starting the clustering process and (ii) expand the already formed clusters or create new ones.
- *Scalability and Accuracy Analysis:* We discuss analytically the ability of CORECLUSTER to scale-up, describing its expected running time. We also justify why the k -core decomposition provides the direction under which to perform clustering incrementally. More specifically, we demonstrate that the k -core structure captures the clustering properties of a graph, thus being able to indicate good seed subgraphs for a clustering algorithm. Furthermore, we derive upper bounds about the difference between eigenspaces of successive cores. Finally, we show that the cluster expansion process of the CORECLUSTER framework is closely related to the minimization of the graph cut criterion.
- *Experimental Analysis:* We perform an extensive experimental evaluation regarding the efficiency and accuracy of the CORECLUSTER framework. A large set of experiments were conducted both on synthetic and real-world graphs. This is to evaluate on ground truth information from the synthetic datasets and on the quality of the clusters from the real-world graphs. The empirical results show that the time complexity is improved by 3-4 orders of magnitude (compared to a baseline algorithm), especially for large graphs. Moreover, in the case of graphs with inherent community structure, the quality of the results is maintained or even improved. In additionally, the initial experimentation of Giatsidis et al. (2014) is extended here to a wide range of algorithms in order to identify the properties of the graphs and algorithms that optimize the performance our framework. The CORECLUSTER framework was introduced on the basis of studies of degeneracy in real social graphs (Giatsidis et al., 2011b). Given the interdisciplinary application of graphs, we do not hold claims of universal applicability (i.e., not all types of graphs have the same properties). We conduct here an extensive evaluation of CORECLUSTER in order to outline detectable properties that indicate the conditions under which the proposed framework is useful or meaningless.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 discusses related work and Section 3 introduces some preliminary notions. Section 4 formally introduces the CORECLUSTER framework. The theoretical analysis and the computational complexity of the proposed framework are presented in Sections 5 and 6, respectively. Finally, our extended empirical analysis is presented in Section 7 and we conclude with a discussion about the advantages of the CORECLUSTER framework along with suggestions for future work in Section 8.

2. Related Work

In this section, we review the related work regarding the graph clustering problem, approaches for scaling-up graph clustering and applications of the k -core decomposition.

Graph clustering. The problem of community detection and graph clustering has been extensively studied from several points of view. Some well-known approaches include spectral

clustering (e.g., Ng et al., 2001; Shi and Malik, 2000; White and Smyth, 2005), modularity optimization (e.g., Newman, 2004; Clauset et al., 2004), multilevel graph partitioning (e.g., Metis, Karypis and Kumar, 1998), flow-based methods (Satuluri and Parthasarathy, 2009), hierarchical methods (Newman and Girvan, 2004) and many more. A very informative and comprehensive review over the different approaches can be found in Fortunato (2010). Also, Lancichinetti et al. (2008) have conducted a comparative analysis on the performance of some of the most recent algorithms, in artificial data produced by their parameterized generator of benchmark graphs. In our work, we use the same graph generator as in Lancichinetti et al. (2008) to evaluate our framework. Another recent empirical comparison of community detection algorithms has been performed by Leskovec et al. (2010). There, due to lack of ground-truth data, the evaluation of the produced clusters is achieved applying quality measures, such as conductance. As we will present during our experimental analysis (see Section 7), we follow a similar practice to evaluate our framework in the case of real-world graph data.

Scaling-up graph clustering. The efficiency of graph clustering can be improved in various ways. Two well-known approaches are the ones of *sampling* and *sparsification*. In the case of spectral clustering, sampling-based approaches include the Nyström method (Kumar et al., 2009) and randomized SVD algorithm (Drineas et al., 2004). The approach of Kumar et al. (2009) capitalizes on the Nyström column-sampling method (Williams and Seeger, 2001) which is an efficient technique to generate low-rank matrix approximations. More specifically, a novel technique has been proposed that follows a non uniform sampling of columns of the affinity matrix. Although, Nyström method suffers from high time and memory complexity (Yan et al., 2009). Drineas et al. (2004) proposed the randomized SVD algorithm that essentially samples a number of columns of the Gram matrix with probability proportional to their norms, and performs Principal Component Analysis on the selected features. Nevertheless, the randomized SVM algorithm may need to sample a large number of columns in order to get a sufficient small approximation error in some cases. In (Yan et al., 2009) a fast approximate algorithm for spectral clustering has been presented where two different preprocessors have been used in order to reduce the size of the initial data structure. The first one is the classical k-means algorithm while the other one is the Random Projection tree. In a nutshell, neighbouring data points correspond into a set of local representative points and then the spectral algorithm is executed only on the reduced set of the representative points.

Concerning graph sampling, the goal is to produce a graph of smaller size (nodes and edges), preserving a set of desired graph properties (e.g., degree distribution, clustering coefficient) (Leskovec and Faloutsos, 2006). The work by Maiya and Berger-Wolf (2010), presents a method, based on the notion of expansion properties, to sample a subgraph that preserves the community structure, i.e., contains representative nodes of the communities. Then, the community membership of the nodes that do not belong to the sample can be expressed as an inference problem. Unlike the previous methods that sample both nodes and edges, the graph sparsification algorithm presented in Satuluri et al. (2011) reduces only the number of edges (focusing on inter-community edges) in order to improve the running time of a clustering algorithm. In contrast to the aforementioned methodologies, our approach keeps the structure of the graph intact, without excluding any structural information from the clustering process.

k -core decomposition. The k -core decomposition constitutes a well-established approach for identifying particular subsets of a graph, called k -cores, in an hierarchical way, starting from external vertices and moving to more central ones. The k -cores are important structures in graph theory and their study goes back to the 60s (Erdős, 1963). Seidman (1983) first applied the k -core decomposition to study the cohesion of social networks. Since then, k -core decomposition has been applied in several graph-related tasks, such as graph visualization (Alvarez-Hamelin et al., 2005; Zhang and Parthasarathy, 2012), dense subgraph discovery (Andersen and Chellapilla, 2009) and as an edge ordering criterion for graph coarsening (Abou-Rjeili and Karypis, 2006). Some very recent studies include the extension of the notion of k -cores to directed graphs (Giatsidis et al., 2011a) and core decomposition in massive graphs (Cheng et al., 2011).

3. Preliminaries

Given an undirected graph G , we denote by $V(G)$ and $E(G) \subset V(G) \times V(G)$ the sets of its vertices and edges, respectively. Given a set $S \subseteq V(G)$, we denote by $G[S]$ the induced subgraph of G that is obtained if we remove from it all vertices that do not belong in S . We also define as n and m the number of vertices and edges of graph G , respectively, i.e., $n = |V(G)|$ and $m = |E(G)|$. The neighbourhood of a vertex $v \in V(G)$ is denoted by $N_G(v)$ and contains all vertices of G that are adjacent to v . The degree $\mathbf{deg}_G(v)$ of a vertex v in G , is the number of edges incident to the vertex and is equal to $|N_G(v)|$. The *minimum degree* of graph G , denoted by $\delta(G)$, is the minimum degree of the vertices in G , i.e.,

$$\delta(G) = \min\{\mathbf{deg}_G(v) \mid v \in V(G)\}.$$

Given a non-negative integer k , we define the k -core of a graph G , denoted by $G_k \triangleq \mathbf{core}_k(G)$, as the maximum size subgraph of G with minimum degree k , where k is the *rank* of the core. In a nutshell, in the k -core of a graph G every vertice is adjacent with at least k vertices. The *degeneracy* of a graph G is the maximum k for which G contains a non-empty core. In a more formal way, the degeneracy of a graph is denoted by $\delta^*(G)$ and is given as:

$$\delta^*(G) = \max\{\delta(H) \mid H \subseteq G\}. \quad (3.1)$$

Intuitively, the dense cores of a graph, i.e., those whose ranks are close to $\delta^*(G)$, may serve as starting seeds for any clustering algorithm as they are expected to preserve the clustering structure of the original graph. Later in this paper, we make this statement more precise, providing the necessary theoretical as well as experimental justification.

For a given graph G with $\delta^*(G) = k$, we define its *core expansion sequence* as a sequence of vertex sets $\{V_k, V_{k-1}, \dots, V_0\}$, computed in a recursive top-down way as follows:

$$V_i = \begin{cases} V(\mathbf{core}_k(G)), & \text{if } i = k, \\ V(\mathbf{core}_i(G)) \setminus V_{i+1}, & \text{if } i = k - 1, \dots, 0. \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

We refer to the sets of a core expansion sequence as *layers*, with set V_i being its i^{th} layer (see Fig. 1 for an illustrative example).

In general terms, detecting the i -core of a graph G is an easy process (Batagelj and Zaversnik, 2003): just remove vertices, and edges incident to them, of degree less than




Figure 1: A graph G of degeneracy 4 and its cores. The different colors express the partition of the vertices of the graph to layers $V_4, V_3, V_2, V_1,$ and V_0 . Fat-edges indicate parts of a clustering of the graph.

i until this is not possible any more. It can be easily verified that $O(k \cdot n)$ steps are required for the computation of the k -core decomposition. Typically, the degeneracy of real world graphs is small, making the computation of the *core expansion sequence* an easy computational task.

4. Graph Clustering with Degeneracy

In this section, we describe in detail the proposed graph clustering framework. CORECLUSTER capitalizes on the concept of degeneracy to improve the efficiency of graph clustering. The main idea behind our approach is that the k -core decomposition preserves the clustering structure of a graph and therefore the “best” k -core subgraph can be used as good starting point for a clustering method. At the same time, the decomposition provides an hierarchical organization of the nodes in the graph, that can serve as a “guide” for the clustering process.

4.1 The CoreCluster Framework

One of the main attributes of the proposed framework, which constitutes our initial motivation, is its ability to accelerate the application of computationally complex clustering algorithms without any significant loss in their accuracy. Suppose we have a clustering algorithm that takes as input a graph G and outputs a partition of $V(G)$ into a number of sets that form a clustering of G . As our method could be applied at any clustering algorithm, we do not further specify the attributes of such an algorithm and we, abstractly, name it **Cluster**. Furthermore, we assume that **Cluster** algorithm runs in $O(n^3)$ steps. This assumption coincides with the computational complexity of the spectral clustering algorithm

Algorithm 1 CORECLUSTER(G)

Input: A graph G .

Output: A partition of $V(G)$ into clusters.

```

1:  $k := \delta^*(G)$ 
2:  $q := 0$ 
3: Let  $V_k, \dots, V_0$  be the core expansion sequence of  $G$ 
4: Let  $G_i$  be the  $i$ -core of  $G$ , for  $i = 0, \dots, k$ 
5:  $S_k = V_k$ 
6:  $\mathcal{A}_k = \{C_1^k, \dots, C_{\rho_k}^k\} = \mathbf{Cluster}(G[S_k])$ 
7: for  $i = k - 1$  to  $0$  do
8:    $S_i = \mathit{Select}(G_i, \mathcal{A}_k \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{A}_{i+1}, V_i)$ 
9:    $\mathcal{A}_i = (C_1^i, \dots, C_{\rho_i}^i) = \mathbf{Cluster}(G[S_i])$ 
10: end for
11: Return  $\mathcal{A}_k \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{A}_0$ 

```

proposed by Ng et al. (2001) and utilized in our initial experiments as well as during the theoretical analysis of our methodology. In the totality of our experiments (see Section 7), we study more than the computational complexity and we utilize various algorithms in the place of **Cluster** including “fast” algorithms.

In a nutshell, the CORECLUSTER framework applies the **Cluster** algorithm at the highest k -core of the graph and then it iterates from the highest to the lowest core applying the following strategy:

- i. assign based on a simple criterion all the nodes that can be assigned to the already existing clusters, and
- ii. apply the **Cluster** algorithm to the remaining nodes (in order to create new clusters).

A sketch of CORECLUSTER framework is given in pseudocode in Alg. 1. Initially, CORECLUSTER performs k -core decomposition to obtain the core expansion sequence of the graph. Then, algorithm **Cluster** is applied to the k -core subgraph, creating the first set of ρ_k clusters. The procedure *Select* (see Section 4.3, for a detailed description) takes as input the, so far, created clusters, i.e., the sets in $\mathcal{F}_{i+1} = \mathcal{A}_k \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{A}_{i+1}$ and the i^{th} layer V_i , and tries to assign each of the vertices of V_i in some cluster in $\mathcal{A}_k \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{A}_{i+1}$. After this update, the procedure *Select* returns the unassigned vertices. The choice of the selection procedure considers the way under which the vertices of V_i are adjacent with the vertices of the clusters in $\mathcal{A}_k \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{A}_{i+1}$. This selection can be done by using several heuristic approaches, and next we describe such a procedure. Afterwards, the **Cluster** is applied to the unassigned vertices returned from the *Select* procedure. The whole procedure is implemented for each layer (V_i) in a recursive manner, starting from the highest level.

4.2 Spectral Clustering

It should be stressed that the CORECLUSTER can be essentially seen as a “meta-algorithmic procedure” that can be applied to any graph clustering algorithm, accelerating the execution and preserving the clustering structure of the latter. The discussion that follows in the

experimental analysis (Section 7) of the paper argues that this indeed can accelerate a high-demanding clustering algorithm without any significant expected loss in its performance.

The spectral clustering algorithm, proposed by Ng et al. (2001), is one of the most important and well-known algorithms in data mining and constitutes the initial motivation of the proposed framework, since its computational complexity restrict its applicability to large graph networks. Under this prism, we use spectral clustering as the baseline and the basis for the theoretical analysis of the CORECLUSTER framework (algorithm **Cluster**). The central idea of the spectral clustering algorithm is to keep the top ρ eigenvectors of the normalized Laplacian matrix, defined as:

$$\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{D}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{D} - \mathbf{W})\mathbf{D}^{-1/2} = \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{D}^{-1/2}\mathbf{W}\mathbf{D}^{-1/2}, \quad (4.1)$$

where $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $\mathbf{D} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ are the adjacency and the degree matrix, respectively. The adjacency matrix gives the similarity between pairs of graph vertices, such that $\mathbf{W}_{ij} > 0$ if there is an edge from vertex i to vertex j and zero ($\mathbf{W}_{ij} = 0$) otherwise. If the graph is undirected, as happens in our case, the adjacency matrix is symmetric ($\mathbf{W}_{ij} = \mathbf{W}_{ji}$). The degree matrix is a diagonal matrix containing the degrees of the nodes on its diagonal, e.g., $\mathbf{D}_{ii} = \sum_j \mathbf{W}_{ij}$. Afterward, assign the corresponding eigenvectors as columns to a matrix $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times \rho}$ and apply k -means clustering on the rows of Y . Thereafter, each row of the new formed matrix corresponds to a data point, while the parameter ρ identifies the number of clusters that we are looking for.

It has been shown that the performance of the k -means is strongly affected by the initialization scheme (Bubeck et al., 2012). Until now, various approaches have been proposed for the initialization of k -means algorithm (Arthur and Vassilvitskii, 2007; Redmond and Heneghan, 2007; Lu et al., 2008). During our empirical analysis (Section 7), we are using the k -means++ algorithm proposed by Arthur and Vassilvitskii (2007), instead of the classical k -means algorithm, taking advantage of performing better seeding during the initialization process. Moreover, since we desire to have an automatic choice of ρ , we define it by noticing the “sudden drop” in the eigenvalues as it is suggested by Polito and Perona (2001).

4.3 Selection procedure

In this section, we give a detailed description of the selection procedure (*Select*) presented in Line 8 of Alg. 1. The procedure takes as input the, so far, created clustering $\mathcal{F}_{i+1} = \mathcal{A}_k \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{A}_{i+1}$ and the vertex set V_i . Then, this procedure assigns some of the vertices of V_i to the clusters in \mathcal{F}_{i+1} and outputs the remaining ones.

For simplicity purposes, we will call the tuple (G, \mathcal{F}, V) as a *candidate triple*, where G is a graph and $\mathcal{F} \cup \{V\}$ is a partition of $V(G)$. Thus, given a *candidate triple* (G, \mathcal{F}, V) , we define the following property over the vertices of V :

$$\mathbf{P}^{\alpha, \beta}(v) = \exists C \in \mathcal{F} : \frac{|N_G(v) \cap V(C)|}{|N_G(v)|} \geq \alpha \quad \text{and} \quad |N_G(v)| \geq \beta, \quad (4.2)$$

where $\alpha > 0.5$ and β is a positive integer. Notice that, as $\alpha > 0.5$, the truth of $\mathbf{P}^{\alpha, \beta}(v)$ can be certified by a unique set C in \mathcal{F} . We call such a set the *certificate* of verticle v .

The selection procedure first (lines 1–4) tries to assign vertices of V to clusters of \mathcal{F} using the criterion of the property $\mathbf{P}^{\alpha, \beta}$ that assigns a vertex to a cluster only if the vast

Algorithm 2 *Select*(G, \mathcal{F}, V)

Input: A candidate triple (G, \mathcal{F}, V)

Output: A subset S of V and a partition \mathcal{F}' of $V(\mathcal{F}) \cup (V \setminus S)$.

```

1: while  $\mathbf{P}^{\alpha, \beta}(v)$  is true for some  $v \in V$  do
2:    $\mathcal{F} \leftarrow (\mathcal{F} \setminus \{C\}) \cup \{C \cup \{v\}\}$  where  $C$  is the certificate of  $v$ .
3:    $V \leftarrow V \setminus \{v\}$ .
4: end while
5:  $V^1 = N_G(V(\mathcal{F}))$ 
6:  $V^2 = V \setminus (V^1 \cup \mathcal{F})$ 
7: if  $V^2$  is either empty or an independent set of  $G$ , then
8:    $\mathcal{F} \leftarrow \text{Assign}(G, \mathcal{F}, V, V^1)$ 
9:    $\mathcal{F} \leftarrow \text{Assign}(G, \mathcal{F}, V, V^2)$ 
10:  return  $\emptyset$ 
11: else
12:  return  $V^1 \cup V^2$ .
13: end if

```

majority of its neighbours belong in this cluster. The quantification of this “vast majority” criterion is done by the constants α and β . The vertices that cannot be assigned at an already existing cluster are partitioned into two groups: (i) V^1 contains those that have neighbours in vertices that are already classified in the clusters of \mathcal{F} and (ii) V^2 contains the rest. As the vertices in V^2 have no neighbours in the clusters, they have at least k neighbours out of them, it is most likely that they may not enter to any existing cluster in the future, unless, possibly, they are completely disjoint. If this is not the case, a further (milder) classification is attempted by the *assign* procedure that first classifies the vertices in V^1 in the existing clusters and then we do the same for the vertices in V^2 . It is worth noting that the last selection procedure has been found useful in our experiments, especially in the case of cores with low rank (where many independent vertices may appear).

The procedure *assign* is a heuristic that classifies each vertex to the cluster that has the majority of its neighbours. Before presenting the *Assign* routine, given by Alg. 3, let us first give some definitions. Given a candidate triple (G, \mathcal{F}, V) and a vertex $v \in V$, we define as $\mathbf{span}(v) = \max\{|N_G(v) \cap V(C)| \mid C \in \mathcal{F}\}$. We also define $\mathbf{argspan}(v)$ as a minimum size $C \in \mathcal{F}$ with the property that $|N_G(v) \cap V(C)| = \mathbf{span}(v)$.

A number of illustrative examples about the choices of the selection procedure can be extracted by Fig. 2, that is an instance of a graph derived from our experimental data (in particular from the D_1 dataset see Sec. 7.1.1). In the particular graph, the 7-core (i.e., the graph delimited by the red square) consists exclusively of the vertices of the grey cluster. The set V_6 contains all the vertices of the 6-core that are not in the 7-core. All but two of these vertices are sparsely connected with the grey cluster, while they exhibit a strong interconnection between them. Therefore, they form the red cluster, while the remaining two vertices, that have all of their neighbours in the gray cluster, become a member of it. A similar assignment to the gray and red clusters is happening for the vertices in V_5 , i.e., the vertices in the 5-core that do not belong in the 6-core. Finally, the remaining vertices of the graph (the vertices in V_4) either clearly belong to the existing clusters or are forming

Algorithm 3 $Assign(G, \mathcal{F}, V, S)$

Input: A candidate triple (G, \mathcal{F}, V) and a subset S of V
Output: A partition \mathcal{F}

```

1: while  $S \neq \emptyset$  do
2:    $\ell = \max\{\mathbf{span}(v) \mid v \in S\}$ 
3:    $L = \{v \in S \mid \mathbf{span}(v) = \ell\}$ 
4:   for each  $v \in L$  do
5:      $C' = C \cup \{v\}$ , where  $C = \mathbf{argspan}(v)$ 
6:      $S \leftarrow S \setminus \{v\}$ 
7:      $\mathcal{F} \leftarrow (\mathcal{F} \setminus \{C\}) \cup \{C'\}$ 
8:   end for
9: end while
10: return  $\mathcal{F}$ 

```

two new clusters, the ping and the purple ones. The experimental analysis indicates that a similar clustering behaviour characterizes the entire data set and that it is captured by the CORECLUSTER framework.




Figure 2: An example of the operation of the CORECLUSTER procedure for a portion of a graph used through our experimental study. This graph consists of the core sequence members V_7 , V_6 , V_5 , and V_4 that are included in the black, green (#), blue (*), and red (s) squares respectively. Vertices of different colors correspond to different clusters.

5. Theoretical Analysis of the CoreCluster’s Quality

The intuition behind the CORECLUSTER framework is that the core expansion sequence V_k, V_{k-1}, \dots, V_0 gives a good sense of direction on how to perform clustering in an incremental way. After that, the procedure considers V_{k-1} as the remaining vertices of the $(k-1)$ -core G_{k-1} , and tries to assign them one by one to the already existing clusters $C_1^k, \dots, C_{\rho_k}^k$. The vertices for which an assignment to an already existing cluster is not possible, form the set S_{k-1} and the **Cluster** is now applied on $G[S_{k-1}]$. As the algorithm continues, the existing clusters grow up and the vertices for which this is not possible, are grouped to new clusters. The fact that this procedure approximates satisfactorily the result of the application of **Cluster** to the whole graph is justified by the observation that the early i -cores (i.e., i -cores where i is close to k) are already dense, and therefore *sufficiently coherent*, to provide a good starting clustering that will expand well because of the selection criterion. In fact, the subgraphs obtained by the k -core decomposition, provide an $(1/2)$ -approximation algorithm for the DENSEST-SUBGRAPH problem (Andersen and Chellapilla, 2009).

In the remaining of this section, a number of theoretical results are presented which confirms that the core expansion sequence offers a reliable way for performing any clustering methodology incrementally. Our theoretical analysis could be divided on three main axis:

1. Initially, we justify why the k -core subgraph can be supposed as a seed subgraph for any clustering algorithm, as nodes with a high clustering coefficient are usually retained at the highest k -core subgraph.
2. Afterwards, based on the perturbation theory, we demonstrate that the difference between eigenspaces of successive cores is upper bounded. Under this prism, we are able to analyze the conditions under which the eigenspaces of successive cores vary significantly with each other.
3. Last but not least, we highlight that the cluster expansion process, which assigns the vertices of V_i to an already existing cluster by using the selection criterion, is closely related to minimizing the graph cut criterion.

5.1 Quality of the maximal core as a starting seed

We claim that the decomposition identifies subgraphs that progressively correspond to the most central regions and connected parts of the graph. Here we show that nodes with high clustering coefficient in G , are more likely to “survive” at the highest k -core subgraph by the pruning (k -core decomposition) procedure. At this point, let us describe the clustering coefficient (Watts and Strogatz, 1998) measure which will be used later through the analysis of our framework. The clustering coefficient measures the density of triangles in the graph and indicates the degree to which nodes tend to cluster together. More specifically, the local clustering coefficient of a vertex is defined as the ratio of the links that the vertex has with the vertices of its neighbourhood to the total number of edges that could exist among the vertices within its neighbourhood. On the other hand, the global clustering coefficient is defined as the mean of the local clustering coefficients over all graph vertices. Our claim is based on the following theorem.

Theorem 1 (Gleich and Seshadhri (2012)) *Let G be a graph with heavy-tailed degree distribution, and let C_G be the (global) clustering coefficient of G . Then, there exists a k -core in G for $k \geq C_G \frac{d_{\max}^\varepsilon}{2}$, where $\varepsilon < 1$ is a constant such that most edges are incident to a node with degree at least d_{\max}^ε (typically $\varepsilon = 2/3$), where d_{\max} is the maximum degree of the nodes.*

The above theorem implies that graphs with heavy-tailed degree distribution and high global clustering coefficient C_G , have large degeneracy. Next we present our claim for the relationship between the local clustering coefficient C_v , $\forall v \in V(G)$ and the k -core subgraph justifying the selection of the k -core as good seed subgraph in the clustering procedure.

Corollary 2 *Let G be a graph with heavy-tailed degree distribution. The contribution of each node $v \in V(G)$ to the k -core decomposition of the graph is proportional to the local clustering coefficient C_v .*

Proof The global clustering coefficient C_G of the entire graph is given by the average of the local clustering coefficients C_v , $\forall v \in V(G)$, i.e., $C_G = \frac{1}{n} \sum_v C_v$, where $n = |V(G)|$. Then, according to the Theorem 1 we get that:

$$\begin{aligned} k \geq C_G \frac{d_{\max}^\varepsilon}{2} &= \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_v C_v \right) \frac{d_{\max}^\varepsilon}{2} = \underbrace{\left(\frac{1}{n} \frac{d_{\max}^\varepsilon}{2} \right)}_{\gamma} \sum_v C_v \\ \Rightarrow k &\geq \gamma \sum_v C_v, \end{aligned}$$

where parameter γ captures global characteristics of the graph (that depend on the total number of nodes and the maximum degree). \blacksquare

Therefore, nodes with high clustering coefficient (in the original graph) are more likely to be found in the best (max-core) k -core ($k = \delta^*(G)$) subgraph, since they tend to be more robust to the degeneracy process. Thus, the k -core subgraph can be used as good starting point (seed subgraph) for the clustering task. Furthermore, we have experimentally validated the above claim (see Appendix A).

5.2 The Eigenspaces of k-cores

The spectral clustering algorithm of (Ng et al., 2001) is based on the eigenvectors of a Laplacian matrix and here we study the eigenspaces of successive cores in conjunction with the CORECLUSTER approach. The key question we are interested in is under which conditions the ρ largest eigenvectors of the Laplacian $\mathbf{L}^{(i)}$ for the i^{th} core are similar to the corresponding eigenvectors of $\mathbf{L}^{(i+1)}$ for $i = 0, \dots, k-1$? If the eigenspaces are indeed similar then it follows that clustering on a core is a good basis for clustering the entire graph.

To answer this question we defer to *perturbation theory* (Stewart and Sun (1990)) so that we can examine the change of the eigenvalues along with the eigenvectors of a matrix

when a small perturbation is added, corresponding to moving from one core to the next. In the case of spectral clustering, consider that the perturbation between the Laplacian matrices ($\mathbf{L}^{(i)}$ and $\mathbf{L}^{(i+1)}$) of successive cores is given by $\Delta\mathbf{L}^{(i)} = \mathbf{L}^{(i)} - \mathbf{L}^{(i+1)}$.

The key result that we will use, is presented by Davis and Kahan (1970), and bounds the difference between eigenspaces of Hermitian matrices under perturbations.

Theorem 3 (Davis and Kahan (1970)) *Let $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be a Hermitian matrix with spectral resolution given by $[\mathbf{X}_1 \mathbf{X}_2]^\top \mathbf{A} [\mathbf{X}_1 \mathbf{X}_2] = \text{diag}(\mathbf{L}_1, \mathbf{L}_2)$, where $[\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2]$ is unitary with $\mathbf{X}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times \rho}$. Let $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times \rho}$ have orthonormal columns, \mathbf{M} be any Hermitian matrix of order ρ and define the residual matrix as $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{Z} - \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{M}$. Let $\lambda(\mathbf{A})$ represent the set of eigenvalues of \mathbf{A} and suppose that $\lambda(\mathbf{M}) \subset [\alpha, \beta]$ and for some $\delta > 0$, $\lambda(\mathbf{L}_2) \subset \mathbb{R} \setminus [\alpha - \delta, \beta + \delta]$. Then, for any unitary invariant norm, we have:*

$$\|\sin\Theta(\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{X}_1), \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{Z}))\| \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{R}\|}{\delta}, \quad (5.1)$$

where $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{X}_1)$ is the column space of matrix \mathbf{X}_1 .

The spectral resolution of \mathbf{A} is a transformation of it using the unitary matrix $[\mathbf{X}_1 \mathbf{X}_2]$ such that \mathbf{X}_1 spans the *invariant subspace* of \mathbf{A} . The function $\sin\Theta(\cdot, \cdot)$ corresponds to a diagonal matrix of dimension ρ , composed of sines of the *canonical angles* between two subspaces. Roughly speaking, this corresponds to the angles between the bases of the subspaces and measures how the two subspaces differ (see Stewart and Sun, 1990, for details).

Then, the following lemma can be easily derived.

Lemma 4 *Let \mathbf{A} and $\tilde{\mathbf{A}} = \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{E}$ be two $n \times n$ Hermitian matrices whose eigendecompositions are given by $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U}\Lambda\mathbf{U}^\top$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{A}} = \tilde{\mathbf{U}}\tilde{\Lambda}\tilde{\mathbf{U}}^\top$, with corresponding sets of eigenvalues $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n$ and $\tilde{\lambda}_1 \leq \tilde{\lambda}_2 \leq \dots \leq \tilde{\lambda}_n$. Then the following results hold, where \mathbf{U}_1 and $\tilde{\mathbf{U}}_1$ are the matrices of the first ρ eigenvectors of \mathbf{A} and $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$:*

$$\|\sin\Theta(\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{U}_1), \mathcal{R}(\tilde{\mathbf{U}}_1))\|_F \leq \frac{\sqrt{\sum_i \lambda_i^{(\rho)}(\mathbf{E}^\top \mathbf{E})}}{\tilde{\lambda}_{\rho+1} - \lambda_\rho}, \quad (5.2)$$

$$\|\sin\Theta(\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{U}_1), \mathcal{R}(\tilde{\mathbf{U}}_1))\|_2 \leq \frac{\sigma_{\max}(\mathbf{E})}{\tilde{\lambda}_{\rho+1} - \lambda_\rho}, \quad (5.3)$$

where $\lambda^{(\rho)}(\cdot)$ is the largest ρ eigenvalues of a matrix, $\sigma_{\max}(\cdot)$ is the largest singular value of a matrix and $\tilde{\lambda}_{\rho+1} > \lambda_\rho$.

Proof First, note that we can express the eigendecompositions of \mathbf{A} and $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$ as:

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U}\Lambda\mathbf{U}^\top = [\mathbf{U}_1 \mathbf{U}_2] \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \Lambda_2 \end{bmatrix} [\mathbf{U}_1 \mathbf{U}_2]^\top \quad (5.4)$$

$$\tilde{\mathbf{A}} = \tilde{\mathbf{U}}\tilde{\Lambda}\tilde{\mathbf{U}}^\top = [\tilde{\mathbf{U}}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{U}}_2] \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\Lambda}_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{\Lambda}_2 \end{bmatrix} [\tilde{\mathbf{U}}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{U}}_2]^\top. \quad (5.5)$$

Then, we can apply Theorem 3 by setting $\mathbf{X}_1 = \tilde{\mathbf{U}}_1$, $\mathbf{X}_2 = \tilde{\mathbf{U}}_2$, $\mathbf{L}_1 = \tilde{\Lambda}_1$, $\mathbf{L}_2 = \tilde{\Lambda}_2$, $\mathbf{M} = \Lambda_1$ and $\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{U}_1$. Computing the residual matrix \mathbf{R} gives:

$$\mathbf{R} = \tilde{\mathbf{A}}\mathbf{U}_1 - \mathbf{U}_1\Lambda_1 = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{U}_1 + \mathbf{E}\mathbf{U}_1 - \mathbf{U}_1\Lambda_1 = \mathbf{E}\mathbf{U}_1.$$

The Frobenius norm of the residual is $\|\mathbf{R}\|_F^2 = \text{tr}(\mathbf{U}_1^\top \mathbf{E}^\top \mathbf{E} \mathbf{U}_1) \leq \sum_i \lambda_i^{(\rho)} (\mathbf{E}^\top \mathbf{E})$ where we have used the Rayleigh-Ritz theorem to bound the trace (Lutkepohl, 1997). With the spectral norm we have $\|\mathbf{E}\mathbf{U}_1\|_2 = \sigma_{\max}(\mathbf{E}\mathbf{U}_1) \leq \sigma_{\max}(\mathbf{E})$ using a similar process. It is easy to show that δ is computed as $\tilde{\lambda}_{\rho+1} - \lambda_\rho$ provided $\tilde{\lambda}_{\rho+1} > \lambda_\rho$. \blacksquare

It follows that we want to choose a ρ to make the ‘‘eigengap’’ $\tilde{\lambda}_{\rho+1} - \lambda_\rho$ as large as possible whilst having a residual matrix with small maximum eigenvectors. The eigengap corresponds to the quality of the clusters (see von Luxburg, 2007, for example), while the perturbation represents the residual eigenvalues whilst moving from one Laplacian to the next. In the following part of this subsection we will elaborate on the perturbation by showing how it relates to edges in a graph.

It is worth noting that when we add vertices by going from a core to a lower core, the dimensions of the eigenspace corresponding to the new vertices will be zero in the higher core. Therefore, we restrict the analysis of the eigenspace to existing dimensions. In other words, we are interested in the following matrix:

$$\Delta \mathbf{L}^{(i)} = \hat{\mathbf{L}}^{(i)} - \mathbf{L}^{(i+1)}, \quad (5.6)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{L}}^{(i)}$ is the submatrix of $\mathbf{L}^{(i)}$ corresponding to the vertices in the $(i+1)^{\text{th}}$ core. The individual elements of the normalized Laplacian are computed as:

$$\mathbf{L}_{xy} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x = y \text{ and } \mathbf{deg}(v_x) \neq 0 \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathbf{deg}(v_x)\mathbf{deg}(v_y)}} & \text{if } x \neq y \text{ and } (v_x, v_y) \in E(G) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (5.7)$$

so we have $\mathbf{L}_{xy} \in [-1, 1]$ for all x, y . Note that off-diagonal elements are non-positive. This allows us to introduce our main result.

Theorem 5 *Let $\mathbf{L}^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times n_i}$ be the Laplacian matrix corresponding to the i^{th} core of a graph, and $\hat{\mathbf{L}}^{(i)}$ be the submatrix of $\mathbf{L}^{(i)}$ corresponding to the vertices in the $(i+1)^{\text{th}}$ core. Similarly, $E^{(i)}$ is the set of edges in the i^{th} core, and $\hat{E}^{(i)}$ is the subset of $E^{(i)}$ with one vertex in the $(i+1)^{\text{th}}$ core. Then the following results hold with \mathbf{U}_1 and $\tilde{\mathbf{U}}_1$ as the matrices of the first ρ eigenvectors of $\hat{\mathbf{L}}^{(i)}$ and $\mathbf{L}^{(i+1)}$:*

$$\|\sin\Theta(\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{U}_1), \mathcal{R}(\tilde{\mathbf{U}}_1))\|_F \leq \frac{\sqrt{|J_i|}|i-k|}{ik(\tilde{\lambda}_{\rho+1} - \lambda_\rho)}, \quad (5.8)$$

$$\|\sin\Theta(\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{U}_1), \mathcal{R}(\tilde{\mathbf{U}}_1))\|_2 \leq \frac{\sqrt{n_{i+1}}|i-k|}{ik(\tilde{\lambda}_{\rho+1} - \lambda_\rho)}, \quad (5.9)$$

where $J_i = \bigcup_{(v_x, v_y) \in \Delta E^{(i)}} N_{G_i}(v_x, v_y)$ is the number of changes in the Laplacian, $\Delta E^{(i)} = \hat{E}^{(i)} - E^{(i+1)}$ is the change in the edges, $N_G(v_x, v_y)$ is the set of edges adjacent to and including the edge (v_x, v_y) in G and $\tilde{\lambda}_{\rho+1} > \lambda_\rho$.

Proof The change in Laplacian elements between cores can be bounded for $x \neq y$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \mathbf{L}_{xy}^{(i)} &= -\frac{1}{\sqrt{\deg_{G_i}(v_x)\deg_{G_i}(v_y)}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\deg_{G_{i+1}}(v_x)\deg_{G_{i+1}}(v_y)}} \\ &\geq \frac{i-k}{ik}, \end{aligned}$$

where $G_i = \mathbf{core}_i(G)$. It follows that the Frobenius norm of the change in Laplacians is bounded as:

$$\|\Delta \mathbf{L}^{(i)}\|_F^2 = \sum_{x,y} (\Delta \mathbf{L}_{xy}^{(i)})^2 \leq |J_i| \left(\frac{i-k}{ik} \right)^2.$$

Note also that $\|\Delta \mathbf{L}^{(i)}\|_F^2 = \sum_j \lambda_j^2(\Delta \mathbf{L}^{(i)})$. The spectral norm can be written in terms of maximising the Rayleigh quotient:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta \mathbf{L}^{(i)}\|_2^2 &= \max \frac{\mathbf{u}^T (\Delta \mathbf{L}^{(i)})^2 \mathbf{u}}{\mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{u}} \\ &\leq n_{i+1} \left(\frac{i-k}{ik} \right)^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{i+1}}$. Putting the pieces together with Lemma 4 gives the required result. \blacksquare

According to this theorem, we can readily show the scenarios in which moving from the i^{th} core to the $(i+1)^{\text{th}}$ core does not significantly alter the eigenspaces. The $\frac{i-k}{ik}$ term implies that for a fixed degeneracy k the core transitions close to k result in small eigenspace perturbations. In the case of Frobenius norm, the eigenspaces grow apart at a rate proportional to the neighbourhood of edge changes within the $(i+1)^{\text{th}}$ core. On the other hand, for the spectral norm we see that the eigenspaces diverge according to the size (n_{i+1}) of the $(i+1)^{\text{th}}$ core.

5.3 Cluster Expansion

The analysis so far has considered changes between cores however an important part of the CORECLUSTER algorithm is how clusters are grown in a greedy fashion according to Alg. 2. In this section we show a close relationship between the selection criterion and the the notion of graph cuts, which motivate many spectral clustering approaches. To see the connection, first we define the cut of a graph as follows:

$$\text{cut}(C_1, C_2) = \sum_{v_i \in C_1, v_j \in C_2} \mathbf{W}_{ij}, \quad (5.10)$$

and it corresponds to the number of edges between disjoint subsets $C_1, C_2 \subset V(G)$. Based on this definition the cut for a partition into ρ clusters is defined as:

$$\text{cut}(C_1, \dots, C_\rho) = \sum_{i=1}^{\rho} \text{cut}(C_i, \bar{C}_i), \quad (5.11)$$

where \bar{C} is the set of vertices in G that are not in C . Consider adding a new vertex v to the graph, then the change in the cut term corresponding to candidate cluster C_j is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
 \Delta cut_j &= cut(C'_j, \bar{C}'_j) - cut(C_j, \bar{C}_j) \\
 &= cut(C_j, \bar{C}_j) + |N_G(v) \cap V(\bar{C}_j)| - cut(C_j, \bar{C}_j) \\
 &= |N_G(v) \cap V(\bar{C}_j)| \\
 &= |N_G(v)| - |N_G(v) \cap V(C_j)|,
 \end{aligned}$$

where $C'_j = C_j \cup \{v\}$. The connection to the selection criteria of Eq. 4.2 can be seen by noting that the minimization of Δcut_j corresponds to choosing a cluster j for the vertex v which maximises $|N_G(v) \cap V(C_j)|$. In this sense, the values of $\alpha|N_G(v)|$ and β can be seen respectively as confidence thresholds on the number of neighbours in the chosen cluster and the degree of the vertex at hand.

6. Complexity

The proposed CORECLUSTER procedure executes the graph clustering algorithm (**Cluster**(G)) on the subgraphs induced by the subsets S_k, \dots, S_0 . Each S_i corresponds to a subset of vertices of V_i that cannot be assigned to already existing clusters according to the selection procedure (see Step 8 of Alg. 1). Thus, the selection step makes it possible for some of the vertices in V_i to be incorporated in an already created cluster, reducing the burden of the computation of **Cluster**($G[S_i]$).

In this way, it becomes apparent that the speed up of the algorithm is attributed to the fact that the CORECLUSTER(G) runs in $k + 1$ disjoint subgraphs of G instead of G itself. As the i -th selection phase requires $O(|V(G_i)|^3)$ steps, we conclude that the running time of CORECLUSTER(G) is bounded by

$$\sum_{i=k, \dots, 0} O(|S_i|^3) \leq \sum_{i=k, \dots, 0} O(|V_i|^3) \leq O(k \cdot n_{\max}^3), \tag{6.1}$$

where $n_{\max} = \max\{|V_k|, \dots, |V_0|\}$. In the above bound, the first equality holds only in the extremal case where no selection occurs during the selection phases. Clearly, the general bound in Eq. 6.1 is the best possible when $|V_k|, \dots, |V_0|$ tend to be equally distributed (which would accelerate the running time by a factor of k^2). According to the first inequality of Eq. 6.1 the running time of the algorithm is proportional to $(k + 1) \cdot n_{\max}^3$, where $n_{\max} = \max\{|S_k|, \dots, |S_0|\}$. Let $\rho_G = \max\left\{\frac{|V(G)|}{|S_i|} \mid i = 0, \dots, k\right\}$ and $\mu_G = \max\left\{\frac{|V(G)|}{|V_i|} \mid i = 0, \dots, k\right\}$. Therefore, we observe that $\rho_G \geq \mu_G$. Notice that the discrepancy between ρ_G and μ_G is a measure of the acceleration of the algorithm because of the selection phases.

Concluding, the acceleration of CORECLUSTER is upper bounded by

$$\sum_{i=k, \dots, 0} O(|S_i|^3) = O\left(\frac{k}{\rho_G^3} \cdot n^3\right).$$

This estimation is purely theoretical and its purpose is to expose the general complexity contribution of our algorithmic machinery. In practice, the acceleration can be *much better* and this also depends on the heuristics that are applied at the selection phase.

7. Experimental Evaluation

The CORECLUSTER framework is intended to be used with algorithms of high computational complexity as its’ primal purpose is to “lower” the cost of such algorithms and apply them only on the “important parts” of a graph. This can be demonstrated simply by utilizing an expensive algorithm (see Section 4.2) as we do in our experiments. The computational cost becomes obviously smaller as the sum of the parts (in processing time) is smaller than the total for algorithms with high complexity (e.g., $O(n^3)$).

The degeneracy behaviour of graphs might differ along with their other properties (e.g., density, etc.). Thus, in this section, we introduce additional experiments to study the effectiveness of CORECLUSTER framework under different scenarios. The purpose of these experiments is to identify in a clear manner the properties of the graphs and the utilized algorithms that best optimize its’ performance.

7.1 Datasets description

While real networks are the objective, actual datasets lack ground truth which leaves only evaluation metrics of the quality of clustering as an option and not direct comparison. On the other hand, artificial networks offer ground truth and a large variety of properties that can be parameterized to produce different “types” of networks. The evaluation of our framework is conducted on both real and artificial networks in order to have complete and decisive results.

7.1.1 ARTIFICIAL NETWORKS

We exploit the graph generator by Fortunato Lancichinetti et al. (2008) to produce graphs with a clustering structure which is available to the tester (ground truth). This graph generator provides a wide range of input parameters. We used the parameters presented on Table 1 and tuned them accordingly, by considering various combinations in order to get a wide range of graphs with different features. Thus, the testing of our approach is credible as it is evaluated in essentially hundreds of graphs with different properties and quality of the clustering structure. The parameters used are: N is the size of the graph, max_d is the maximum node degree, min_d is the minimum node degree and μ is the mixing parameter representing the overlapping between clusters, i.e., each node shares a fraction $1 - \mu$ of its links with the other nodes of its community and a fraction μ with the other nodes of the network. Graphs produced by the generator contain inherent clusters and the cluster assignment is offered by the generator, enabling thus usage of these data sets for evaluating graph clustering algorithms. In order to ensure a thorough and robust evaluation, for each of the combinations among the parameters, we generated 10 distinct graphs.

Table 1 depicts the various parameters’ values for the three main different settings in our experiments. It becomes apparent that the most important parameter is the min_d , as it is the one differentiating the overall density of the graph.

	D1	D2	D3
max_d (node max degree)	10%, 30%,	10%, 30%, 50%	200 edges
min_d (node min degree)	~ 5 (the absolutely minimum)	7	20
μ (mixing parameter)	1% – 43% (in 7 equal steps)	3% – 43% (in 6 equal steps)	3% – 43% (in 6 equal steps)
N (graph size in nodes)	100–3600	100–3600	100–3600

Table 1: Parameters’ values for the artificial graphs.

7.1.2 REAL NETWORKS

We also perform evaluations to a subset of the *Facebook 100* dataset provided by Traud et al. (2011). This is a collection of friendship networks of *Facebook* from 2005, for 100 US Universities (i.e., 100 individual networks). The evaluations were not performed to the full extend of this dataset as hardware limitation did not allow us to evaluate, with spectral clustering, networks with more than 13K nodes (the CORECLUSTER framework could handle much larger networks). About half of the networks from this dataset were used for the final evaluation.

7.2 Evaluation Metrics

To evaluate the clustering results we use different metrics for the artificial and the real (*Facebook 100*) data.

- **Artificial networks:** Given the ground truth, we measure the quality of the clustering results in terms of the widely used Normalized Mutual Information (NMI, Manning et al., 2008). NMI measures how “clear” each found cluster is in relevance to the known clusters (taking into account the size of the cluster as well).

Let $\Omega = \{\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots, \omega_k\}$ be the set of detected clusters and $\mathbb{C} = \{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_j\}$ the set of known clusters (ground-truth). Then, NMI is given as follows:

$$\text{NMI}(\Omega, \mathbb{C}) = \frac{I(\Omega, \mathbb{C})}{[H(\Omega) + H(\mathbb{C})]/2}, \quad (7.1)$$

where I is the mutual information:

$$I(\Omega; \mathbb{C}) = \sum_k \sum_j \frac{|\omega_k \cap c_j|}{N} \log \left(\frac{N|\omega_k \cap c_j|}{|\omega_k||c_j|} \right), \quad (7.2)$$

and H is the Entropy:

$$H(\Omega) = - \sum_k \frac{|\omega_k|}{N} \log \left(\frac{|\omega_k|}{N} \right). \quad (7.3)$$

- **Facebook:** Since the networks of this dataset lack ground truth, we choose to evaluate the results with the evaluation criterion of conductance. Given a graph G and a cut (S, \bar{S}) , conductance is defined as:

$$\phi(S) = \frac{\sum_{i \in S, j \notin S} A_{ij}}{\min(a(S), a(\bar{S}))},$$

where A_{ij} are the entries in the adjacency matrix \mathbf{A} of G and $a(S) = \sum_{i \in S} \sum_{j \in G} A_{ij}$. Informally, conductance measures (for a cluster) the ratio of internal to external connectivity. It has been used widely to examine clustering quality (e.g., Leskovec et al. (2010)) and has a simple and intuitive definition.

Both NMI and Conductance measures takes values in the range of $(0, 1)$. It is also important to be noticed that:

1. For NMI, **higher** values are better.
2. For Conductance, **lower** values are indicating better clustering quality.

7.3 Algorithms for Additional Evaluation

Apart from the spectral clustering algorithm proposed by Ng et al. (2001), we expand the study of our framework to a wide variety of algorithms. The purpose of this extended study is to evaluate the clustering performance of CORECLUSTER various properties these algorithms might display. At the same time, we examine whether the properties of the graphs affect the framework in a consistent manner (i.e., the performance is good for the same “type” of graphs across different algorithms). The latter is justified through this extended analysis and establishes clear conditions for the use CORECLUSTER.

We considered algorithms indiscriminately of their computational complexity, focusing more on how they approach the clustering problem (i.e., what they try to optimize). In the following, we list in sort the clustering algorithms that have been considered in our analysis.

- **InfoMap** (Rosvall et al., 2009): An information theoretic approach that tackles the problem of graph clustering as a compression problem. For random walks over a graph the probability of flow is converted to a description. By minimizing the description length of the nodes in the flow’s path, InfoMap optimizes the network’s partitions.
- **Leading Eigenvector** (Newman, 2006): In order to optimize modularity, this method uses the eigenvector corresponding to the largest eigenvalue of the modularity matrix. While this is also a spectral method, the calculation of the leading eigenvector is much more efficient as it can be done with the power iteration method.
- **Fast Greedy** (Clauset et al., 2004): This is another modularity optimization algorithm that works in a greedy manner. It follows an hierarchical agglomerative process, starting from each node being a unique community and joining communities that produce the highest modularity.
- **MCL** (Van Dongen, 2000): The Markov Cluster (*MCL*) algorithm follows a simple iteration of two steps over the transition probability matrix T of graph : i) raise T to

an integer power and ii) raise the values in the cells of the latter resulting matrix in a real valued power p . The two steps “represent”: i) the probability that a random walker takes a specific path in p steps and ii) enhancing the probability that two nodes are connected in with “greater strength” for larger values from step a.

- **Metis** (Karypis and Kumar, 1998): Metis relies on a multilevel approach where the graph is coarsened (vertices are unified and edge weights are adjusted accordingly). Then follows the partitioning of the coarsened graph and the projection of the clusters back to the original one. It is a well established algorithm with low computational cost that has been shown to be very effective.
- **MultiLevel** (Blondel et al., 2008): The term *MultiLevel* is used to refer to the greedy optimization algorithm introduced by Blondel et al. (2008). This approach is similar to *Fast Greedy* algorithm with the difference that, at each iteration, joined vertices are replaced with single nodes (similarly to metis).
- **SpinGlass** (Reichardt and Bornholdt, 2006): A cross-discipline approach, that interprets the community structure of a graph as the spin configuration with the minimum energy of the spin glass (spin glass: disordered magnet, spin: magnetic orientation, the spin states represent the community indices). In essence, this algorithm deals with the adhesion between vertices which is the equivalent of edge betweenness and provides a different approach to the work of Clauset et al. (2004)
- **Walktrap** (Pons and Latapy, 2005): The main intuition behind this algorithm is that short random walks will tend to stay in the same communities. Thus the transition probability between two vertices will be high if they are in the same community (for *short* random walks and adjusting for the degree of a vertex). By using this property as distance, clustering can be applied with an agglomerative approach (for efficiency).

7.4 Performance

7.4.1 ARTIFICIAL DATA, NMI COMPARISON

As mentioned on the previous sections, we wish to evaluate the performance of our framework in multiple aspects. We start here with the artificial data, comparing the performance in relevance to the *NMI* metric. This comparison is separate for each of the three groups of the artificial data. Moreover, we compare across the parameters of the data generator (Table 1) as those affect crucial aspects of the graph’s structure (density, cluster clarity, etc.). These parameters also affect the degeneracy properties of the graph (number of nodes in the maximum k -core, number of core partitions etc.).

We organize the comparisons per algorithm. For each of the aforementioned clustering algorithms, we display the evaluation of the “original version” (which we will refer to as *Baseline* in all comparisons) in comparison to the evaluation for the corresponding CORECLUSTER “combination” (CORECLUSTER utilizing the *Baseline* in place of the **Cluster** algorithm as described in Section 4).

Thus for each algorithm we have three figures (one for each of the aforementioned artificial data sets - Section 7.1.1) displaying the NMI clustering evaluation metric in relevance to the cluster size as well as the mixing parameter (that affects the “clarity” of the clusters).




Figure 3: Clustering quality comparisons in terms of NMI for the three artificial graphs (D1, D2, and D3) (Part I).

We start this comparison at Figure 3 with the Spectral Clustering algorithm. In this case, we observe that the CORECLUSTER solution performs quite close to the Baseline and




Figure 3: Clustering quality comparisons in terms of NMI for the three artificial graphs (D1, D2, and D3) (Part II).

in fact outperforms it in many occasions. We further make an initial note on the effect of graph density to the quality of the results for our framework. Thus, we can remark that the largest gap between the Baseline and CORECLUSTER across all algorithms is observed for the D3 dataset, which has the biggest density.

This is an expected result as the global density of the graph affects the maximum k -core number and the partitions generated by the k -core decomposition algorithm. Graphs that are very dense will have a high maximum core number but there will be no partition of significance. In simpler terms, when all the nodes are highly connected, they are all likely to belong in high-core partitions and subsequently the biggest portion of the graph could

belong to the maximum core. The case of the D3 dataset displays this point as it was intentionally generated with high density. On the contrary, D1 was generated as a case closer to the density of real graphs and D2 was generated as an intermediate case. We see consistently along all experiments that the general graph density affects more or less the same our framework. The cases in D3 where CORECLUSTER performs in a similar manner with the Baseline are of those with low mixing parameter. The reason for this is twofold:

1. The clusters are better separated from each other.
2. While the minimum and the maximum node degree are the main parameters that affect directly the density of the generated graph, the mixing parameter contributes as well. Thus, for low mixing parameters, we can get lower densities as well in all of the datasets.

Our framework is designed based on analysis of real networks and their Degeneracy (Giatsidis et al., 2011b,c) and for this reason datasets with “abnormal” behaviour in the Degeneracy aspect are expected to give bad evaluations. Intuitively, in order to provide acceleration to the “input” algorithm (**Cluster**), the size of \mathbf{core}_i should be (significantly) smaller than the size of \mathbf{core}_{i-1} . Otherwise, the incremental nature of our framework would not make sense.

Moving to the rest of the algorithms, we see similarly that CORECLUSTER performs quite close to the Baseline for most cases. In addition to the cases of high density, we would like to study in detail other parameters that also affect the divergence between the two algorithms (the Baseline and CORECLUSTER). For this reason in the following sections, we examine in depth properties of both the graph and the Baseline algorithms in order to clearly outline the evaluation of the CORECLUSTER framework.

It is also worth noting that the *SpinGlass* algorithm is missing evaluations for the larger graphs in the Baseline part. Its execution was conducted with the implementation provided by *igraph*¹ and it was riddled with abruptly terminations on these datasets. Only a small portion of the data was processed successfully with just the Baseline and for this reason we present only the parts that were covered thoroughly (i.e., more than one graph per combination passed the processing with SpinGlass).

7.4.2 ANALYSIS: GRAPH AND ALGORITHM PROPERTIES - ARTIFICIAL DATA

In this part of our work, we present a thorough analysis of the evaluations in regards to the following two aspects:

- **Performance analysis in relevance to the coverage of the maximum-core:** How much of the complete graph exists in the max-core versus the NMI from CORECLUSTER.
- **“Final Performance” vs “Performance at the Maximum-Core”:** The relation of the performance of the Baseline on the max-core versus that of CORECLUSTER at the entire graph.

Similarly to the performance evaluations presented in Section 7.4.3, the aforementioned evaluations are conducted per Dataset (D1,D2,D3).

1. <http://igraph.org/c/>

How to use the information bellow

Most tools and algorithms in the Machine Learning domain require a lot of experimentation and fine tuning before deployment. Since CORECLUSTER is a meta algorithmic framework, we are limiting the additional complexity in this process by clearly marking properties that are easy and efficient to detect before the deployment of our framework. Instead of general remarks on the performance, the next two sections will provide a clear roadmap to anyone who wishes to apply CORECLUSTER on any data.

Performance analysis in relevance to the coverage of the maximum-core The degeneracy properties of a graph can vary greatly in two main aspects. The first one is the k -core number of the graph, i.e., the maximum of interconnectivity for which we can get a non empty part of the graph. The other one is the number of nodes for all the possible cores from 0 to k . As graphs with communities are complex structures with dense and sparse areas, it would be disorienting to evaluate all possible properties for a graph in relevance to Degeneracy and the performance of CORECLUSTER. For example, while density affects the core numbers, a graph with a high k -core value could be sparse as well. For this reason, we focus on a key aspect that can portray the graph in a major manner. This aspect is the percentage of the graph that is maintained in the maximal k -core. We call this dimension “max-core coverage” and we examine across it how well our framework performs (in terms of NMI).

In Figure 4, we see the comparison between the *max-core coverage* and the NMI of our framework in the entire graph (referred here as *final NMI*). From this comparison, there is clearly a negative correlation between the two. This correlation is consistent across all algorithms which points out that it is a property of the graph that affects the performance of CORECLUSTER. In simple terms, our framework performs better when the *max-core* contains a small percentage of the total graph (and performs worse in the opposite case).

This makes sense in an intuitive manner as well as the reasons for having a high percentage of the graph in the *max-core* coincide with those of having bad or no clustering structures. Regardless of the general density of the graph, the main reason for getting a high “max-core coverage”, is that the distribution of edges among the vertices is close to uniform.

“Final Performance” vs “Performance at the Maximum-Core” Our proposed framework works in an incremental manner starting a cluster from the most cohesive part and adding on top of that. Following this hierarchical manner it is susceptible to errors propagating from the starting basis to the final clustering result. Thus, it is important to evaluate an algorithm at the most cohesive part in order to anticipate the behaviour at the entirety of the graph.

In this section, we would like to study properties of the algorithm and in particular the behaviour of our framework in regards with the starting core (which is the application of the Baseline on the max-core). Specifically we would like to see how the “starting” performance at the maximum core affects the final performance in the entire graph. The performance at the maximum core is evaluated in the same manner as it would be for the entire graph but only for the sub-graph of the maximum core. We assume that:

- the maximum core is the input graph,




Figure 4: Performance analysis in relevance to the coverage of the maximum-core for the three artificial graphs (D1, D2, and D3) (Part I)




Figure 4: Performance analysis in relevance to the coverage of the maximum-core for the three artificial graphs (D1, D2, and D3) (Part I)

- the cluster membership is maintained,

and we simply apply any of the given clustering algorithms. The maximum core contains a very dense part of the graph (Andersen and Chellapilla, 2009). Moreover, it contains the most cohesive parts of the clusters in respect to interconnectivity (i.e., a sub-graph where the number of neighbours k is -at least- the maximal one for all).

In our analysis of the results on the artificially generated data, we noticed that almost 50% of the data contain only one cluster. Many graph clustering algorithms are implemented or originally designed with the assumption that the graph contains multiple clusters. In the current state of our framework, we apply the clustering algorithm in the maximum core without conducting any analysis on the number of the clusters. While the assumption that there will always be more than one cluster makes sense in general cases, in this specific scenario we see two distinctive behaviors.

Therefore, in order to study the effect of the performance at the maximum core, we partition our cases to data that have more than one cluster at the maximum core and data that have only one. For the first case, we report the relation of the NMI at the maximum




Figure 5: “Final Performance” vs “Performance at the Maximum-Core” for the three artificial graphs (D1, D2, and D3) (Part I).





Figure 5: “Final Performance” vs “Performance at the Maximum-Core” for the three artificial graphs (D1, D2, and D3) (Part II).

core versus the NMI on the entire graph. In the second case, since the evaluation at the maximum core is meaningless, we report only the final evaluation on the entire graph.

Starting with Figure 5 (multiple clusters at the maximum core), we see a consistent behaviour:

1. There is an obvious correlation between the performance at the maximum core and that at the entire graph.
2. Combinations of datasets and clustering algorithms that CORECLUSTER was very close to the Baseline, are cases where the latter was performing relatively well on the max-core.
3. The performance at D1 dataset is consistently better. This validates that D1 contains structures which most algorithms would identify as clusters.

One example, of the second observation, is the case of the algorithm “Leading EigenVector” in D1 where the performance of our framework is identical to that of the Baseline. At the same time, Figure 5 indicates that this algorithm was really good at detecting the clusters

Figure 6: Final NMI: **one cluster** at maximum core.

at the maximum core. On the other hand, “InfoMap” is an example of an algorithm that had “failures” at the maximum core which would explain the greater divergence.

Additionally, we examine Figure 6 to provide further insight. With “Walktrap” as a counter example, we see that this algorithm behaves quite similarly to “Leading Eigen-Vector” in the case where we have multiple clusters in the maximum core. But the NMI evaluation is not that similar. We attribute this to the other 50% of the data where we have only one cluster (at the maximum core). In this case, “Walktrap” performs distinctively worse. Upon close examination this algorithm was less capable at detecting that there is only one cluster in the maximum core (in comparison to other algorithms). We can clearly see the result of this in Figure 6.


7.4.3 REAL DATA, CONDUCTANCE COMPARISON

The previous sections offered a great detail on the inner workings of our framework and gave an easy set of techniques to determine how appropriate is the application of our framework without having to perform exhaustive evaluations. Given that the artificial data range over a wide variety of properties, the results on the performance (NMI) might not always reflect the performance on real data. Simply put, the artificial data were intentionally created to stress test our framework in even extreme cases.


In this section, we apply CORECLUSTER into a real dataset along with all of the aforementioned algorithms, and we evaluate its performance with the well know *conductance* metric. In this manner, we provide a complete picture of how well our framework performs and we justify its’ usefulness with real and concrete examples.

In Figure 7, the comparison between the aforementioned “Baselines” (Section 7.3) and the corresponding CORECLUSTER “combination” is presented. Given that the *Facebook* dataset is composed by 100 different graphs, we summarize the clustering performance in the following two aspects:


1. *Conductance per cluster size*: The upper “parts” of the sub-figures in Figure 7 represents the comparison of the clusters found (along all the graphs) in terms of conductance (lower values are better). While conductance reflects in both a practical and intuitive manner the quality of a cluster, the size of the clusters found plays




(a) Spectral Clustering




(b) Leading Eigenvector



(c) Fast Greedy



(d) MCL



(e) Metis

Figure 7: Facebook conductance (Part I).




Figure 7: Facebook conductance (Part II).

an important role (e.g., we can’t consider a clustering “good” if there is one “huge” cluster with high conductance and many “small” ones with low). On an additional note, we excluded from the comparison small non connected components as those are trivial to be detected by any algorithm and don’t provide additional information for the comparison.

2. *Frequency of the bin (bin size)*: For presentation purposes, the aforementioned comparison is done by binning the cluster sizes in logarithmic bins. This is to avoid noise in the plot and to provide a better picture on the average behaviour. In this point, we evaluate the frequency of the bins to further investigate the clustering “tendencies” of the Baselines and their combinations. On the plots we refer to the frequency of the bin as *Bin size*.

With the exception of “MultiLevel”, we see that CORECLUSTER either outperforms the corresponding Baselines or has an almost identical quality of results. Regarding the sizes of the clusters, we see from the frequency of the bins that some of the Baselines (*Spinglass*, *InfoMap*, *Metis*, *MCL*,) are more prone to a specific range of sizes. On the other hand, CORECLUSTER framework maintains a good clustering quality while being able to detect

cluster in all possible ranges indiscriminately of the “input” algorithm. Evidently, this is important as it is not an attribute that all algorithms can demonstrate.

7.4.4 EXECUTION TIME

As a final part of our evaluation, we present the average execution time of the Baselines in comparison to the corresponding one when CORECLUSTER is applied. We once more clarify that not all of the Baseline algorithms are appropriate for “acceleration” with this framework. As mentioned at Section 4, CORECLUSTER is designed to accelerate a computationally expensive algorithm. For the cases of “complex” algorithms, we can see in Figures 8 and 9 the examples of *Spectral Clustering*, *SpinGlass*, *Walktrap* and *MCL* algorithms. In these examples, we see orders of magnitude in the difference between the Baseline and CORECLUSTER that increases exponentially for greater graph sizes.

In the case of the algorithms that are not as computationally expensive there is the added overhead to compute the core structure with the k -core algorithm. This overhead makes the CORECLUSTER slower but we see that the difference is great as the k -core algorithm can be linear to the number of edges (Batagelj and Zaversnik, 2003). This means that the additional cost will not increase immensely for greater graph sizes but, as we also observe in the plots, it will remain within a practically logical range.

Additionally, we note that CORECLUSTER does not require the full graph in memory as it processes parts of the graph incrementally. Added with the fact that CORECLUSTER can outperform the Baseline (e.g., Metis for conductance at Figure 7) we can envision CORECLUSTER being applicable with “fast” algorithms as well.

8. Conclusions


In this paper, we have presented in full detail a framework for optimizing the efficiency of graph clustering. This framework, is capitalizing on the structures produced by the k -core decomposition algorithm. The intuition is that the extreme k -cores maintain the most crucial parts of the clustering structure of the original graph. Our main contribution is the CORECLUSTER framework that processes the graph in an incremental manner and in parts of small size (compared to the entire graph).

We have described how this framework scales-up from an analytical view and why the k -core structure offers an appropriate partition with increased “importance” (to the clustering structure) of vertices. We displayed both of these in an experimental manner as well with a multitude of evaluations. In more detail, we have presented an exhaustive set of experiments on real and artificial data which:


- Displayed the acceleration of computationally expensive algorithms while maintaining high cluster quality.
- Through thorough analysis, described a set of properties -easy to identify and detect- for the proper usage of our framework.

Moreover, we provided an indirect review of the used algorithms and offered insights on their individual performance.


As future work, we plan to further extend and improve our framework in the following aspects:




(a) Spectral Clustering




(b) Leading Eigenvector



(c) Fast Greedy



(d) MCL



(e) Metis

Figure 8: Artificial Graphs execution time (Part I).






Figure 8: Artificial Graphs execution time (Part II).

- Optimize the heuristics and clustering assignments our framework uses when not utilizing the provided clustering algorithm.
- Merging adjacent cores. On a few hand picked occasions, we noticed that the framework would have been more effective if adjacent cores were merged as one. This is mainly for cores that were only marginally different. It could potentially increase the efficiency of execution and the quality of the results if a second pass over the cores merged them appropriately.
- Extend it for directed graphs. For the application of the same model in a directed network, one would have to take into account that degeneracy creates partitions in two different dimensions (incoming and outgoing vertices). Exploring all possible partitions in this case becomes a computation issue by itself.


Finally, we provide our implementation of CORECLUSTER for the use of further experiments and its' application to real world scenarios. The full implementation along with instructions on how to utilize the algorithms described in this paper can be found at: [removedwillbeinthepublishedversion](#)




(a) Spectral Clustering




(b) Leading Eigenvector



(c) Fast Greedy



(d) MCL



(e) Metis

Figure 9: Facebook execution time (Part I).




Figure 9: Facebook execution time (Part II).

Appendix A. Empirical Analysis of the CoreCluster’s Quality

As described in the main part, the intuition behind the CORECLUSTER framework is that the core expansion sequence V_k, V_{k-1}, \dots, V_0 gives a good sense of direction on how to do clustering in an incremental way. Moreover, the observation is that the early i -cores (i.e., i -cores where i is close to k) are already dense, and therefore *sufficiently coherent*, to provide a good starting clustering that will expand well because of the selection criterion.

Figure 10 depicts the above intuition about the datasets used in our experiments (as they are described in the main document). More specifically, it represents the average clustering coefficient of a k -core subgraph with regards to the core index value k (normalized by the maximum k of each graph). This indicates that, overall, a clearer clustering can be given at the maximum k -core. As a reminder, the reader may see the properties of the artificial data presented on Table 1.

The particular results, along with the theoretical justification (described in the main document, Section 5), provide the conclusion that the highest ranked k -core will most likely have the nodes of the graph that belong to the largest clusters and at the same the clustering structure will be the best under the measure of the clustering coefficient. As the




Figure 10: Average clustering coefficient compared to k -core index normalized by the maximum value.

CORECLUSTER framework starts from that subgraph (the maximal k -core), it will perform the best into separating the clusters of this subgraph and then it will move one the "next best" subset of nodes and edges as they are given from the core expansion sequence.

References

- Amine Abou-Rjeili and George Karypis. Multilevel algorithms for partitioning power-law graphs. In *IPDPS*, pages 124–124, 2006.
- José I. Alvarez-Hamelin, Luca Dall’asta, Alain Barrat, and Alessandro Vespignani. k -core decomposition: a tool for the visualization of large scale networks. *arXiv*, 2005.
- Reid Andersen and Kumar Chellapilla. Finding dense subgraphs with size bounds. In *WAW*, pages 25–37, 2009.
- David Arthur and Sergei Vassilvitskii. k -means++: the advantages of careful seeding. In *SODA*, pages 1027–1035, 2007.
- Vladimir Batagelj and Matjaz Zaversnik. An $o(m)$ algorithm for cores decomposition of networks. *CoRR*, 2003.
- Vincent D Blondel, Jean-Loup Guillaume, Renaud Lambiotte, and Etienne Lefebvre. Fast unfolding of communities in large networks. *Journal of statistical mechanics: theory and experiment*, 2008(10):P10008, 2008.
- S. Bubeck, M. Meila, and U. von Luxburg. How the initialization affects the stability of the k -means algorithm. *ESAIM: Probability and Statistics*, 16:436–452, 2012.
- J. Cheng, Yiping Ke, Shumo Chu, and M.T. Ozsü. Efficient core decomposition in massive networks. In *ICDE*, pages 51–62, 2011.

- Aaron Clauset, M. E. J. Newman, and Christopher Moore. Finding community structure in very large networks. *Phys. Rev. E*, 70(6):066111, Dec 2004. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevE.70.066111.
- Chandler Davis and W. M. Kahan. The rotation of eigenvectors by a perturbation. iii. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 7(1):1–46, 1970.
- P. Drineas, A. Frieze, R. Kannan, S. Vempala, and V. Vinay. Clustering large graphs via the singular value decomposition. *Mach. Learn.*, 56(1-3), 2004. ISSN 0885-6125.
- Paul Erdős. On the structure of linear graphs. *Israel J. Math.*, 1:156–160, 1963. ISSN 0021-2172.
- Santo Fortunato. Community detection in graphs. *Physics Reports*, 486(3-5), 2010.
- Christos Giatsidis, Dimitrios M. Thilikos, and Michalis Vazirgiannis. D-cores: Measuring collaboration of directed graphs based on degeneracy. In *ICDM*, pages 201–210, 2011a.
- Christos Giatsidis, Dimitrios M Thilikos, and Michalis Vazirgiannis. D-cores: Measuring collaboration of directed graphs based on degeneracy. In *Data Mining (ICDM), 2011 IEEE 11th International Conference on*, pages 201–210. IEEE, 2011b.
- Christos Giatsidis, Dimitrios M Thilikos, and Michalis Vazirgiannis. Evaluating cooperation in communities with the k-core structure. In *Advances in Social Networks Analysis and Mining (ASONAM), 2011 International Conference on*, pages 87–93. IEEE, 2011c.
- Christos Giatsidis, Fragkiskos Malliaros, Dimitrios M Thilikos, and Michalis Vazirgiannis. Corecluster: A degeneracy based graph clustering framework. In *AAAI’14: 28th Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2014.
- David F. Gleich and C. Seshadhri. Vertex neighborhoods, low conductance cuts, and good seeds for local community methods. In *KDD*, pages 597–605, 2012.
- George Karypis and Vipin Kumar. A fast and high quality multilevel scheme for partitioning irregular graphs. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 20(1):359–392, December 1998. ISSN 1064-8275.
- Sanjiv Kumar, Mehryar Mohri, and Ameet Talwalkar. On sampling-based approximate spectral decomposition. In *ICML’09*, pages 553–560, 2009.
- Andrea Lancichinetti, Santo Fortunato, and Filippo Radicchi. Benchmark graphs for testing community detection algorithms. *Physical Review E*, 78, 2008. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevE.78.046110.
- Jure Leskovec and Christos Faloutsos. Sampling from large graphs. In *KDD*, pages 631–636, 2006. ISBN 1-59593-339-5.
- Jure Leskovec, Kevin J. Lang, and Michael Mahoney. Empirical comparison of algorithms for network community detection. In *WWW*, pages 631–640, 2010.
- J.F. Lu, J.B. Tang, Z.M. Tang, and J.Y. Yang. Hierarchical initialization approach for k-means clustering. *Pattern Recognition Letters*, 29(6):787 – 795, 2008. ISSN 0167-8655.

- Helmut Lutkepohl. Handbook of matrices. *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis*, 2 (25):243, 1997.
- Arun S. Maiya and Tanya Y. Berger-Wolf. Sampling community structure. In *WWW*, pages 701–710, 2010.
- Christopher D. Manning, Prabhakar Raghavan, and Hinrich Schütze. *Introduction to information retrieval*. Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- M. E. J. Newman. Fast algorithm for detecting community structure in networks. *Phys. Rev. E*, 69(6):066133, Jun 2004. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevE.69.066133.
- M. E. J. Newman and M. Girvan. Finding and evaluating community structure in networks. *Physical Review E*, 69, 2004. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevE.69.026113.
- Mark EJ Newman. Finding community structure in networks using the eigenvectors of matrices. *Physical review E*, 74(3):036104, 2006.
- Andrew Y. Ng, Michael I. Jordan, and Yair Weiss. On spectral clustering: Analysis and an algorithm. In *NIPS*, pages 849–856, 2001.
- Marzia Polito and Pietro Perona. Grouping and dimensionality reduction by locally linear embedding. In *NIPS*, pages 1255–1262, 2001.
- Pascal Pons and Matthieu Latapy. Computing communities in large networks using random walks. In *Computer and Information Sciences-ISCIS 2005*, pages 284–293. Springer, 2005.
- Stephen J. Redmond and Conor Heneghan. A method for initialising the k-means clustering algorithm using kd-trees. *Pattern Recognition Letters*, 28(8):965–973, 2007.
- Jörg Reichardt and Stefan Bornholdt. Statistical mechanics of community detection. *Physical Review E*, 74(1):016110, 2006.
- Martin Rosvall, Daniel Axelsson, and Carl T Bergstrom. The map equation. *The European Physical Journal Special Topics*, 178(1):13–23, 2009.
- Venu Satuluri and Srinivasan Parthasarathy. Scalable graph clustering using stochastic flows: applications to community discovery. In *KDD*, pages 737–746, 2009.
- Venu Satuluri, Srinivasan Parthasarathy, and Yiye Ruan. Local graph sparsification for scalable clustering. In *SIGMOD*, pages 721–732, 2011.
- Stephen B. Seidman. Network structure and minimum degree. *Social Networks*, 5(3):269–287, 1983.
- Jianbo Shi and Jitendra Malik. Normalized cuts and image segmentation. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, 22(8):888–905, 2000. ISSN 0162-8828.
- GW Stewart and Ji-Guang Sun. Matrix perturbation theory (computer science and scientific computing), 1990.

- Amanda L. Traud, Peter J. Mucha, and Mason A. Porter. Social structure of facebook networks. *CoRR*, 2011.
- Stijn Van Dongen. A cluster algorithm for graphs. *Report-Information systems*, (10):1–40, 2000.
- Ulrike von Luxburg. A tutorial on spectral clustering. *Statistics and Computing*, 17(4): 395–416, 2007. ISSN 0960-3174.
- D. J. Watts and S. H. Strogatz. Collective dynamics of ‘small-world’ networks. *Nature*, 393 (6684), 1998.
- Scott White and Padhraic Smyth. A spectral clustering approach to finding communities in graph. In *SDM*, 2005.
- Christopher K. I. Williams and Matthias Seeger. Using the nyström method to speed up kernel machines. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 13*, pages 682–688. MIT Press, 2001.
- Donghui Yan, Ling Huang, and Michael I. Jordan. Fast approximate spectral clustering. In *Proceedings of the 15th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, KDD ’09, pages 907–916. ACM, 2009.
- Yang Zhang and Srinivasan Parthasarathy. Extracting analyzing and visualizing triangle k-core motifs within networks. In *ICDE*, pages 1049–1060, 2012.